

Application No. 09/682,489

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS

The Office Action of December 18, 2003 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 2-3, 5-8, 10-11, 13-14, 19, 22, and 25-35 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 25, and 30 are independent claims.

In the specification, this Amendment adds a patent application number and patent numbers that were not known at the time of filing.

In the claims, this Amendment amends claims 1-2, 5-6, 9, 19, and 22, cancels claims 4, 9, 12, 15-18, 20-21, and 23-24, and adds new claims 25-35. Support for these amendments is found in the Applicant's specification for: claims 1, 25, and 30 amended limitations are described generally in paragraph 49 which refers to Figure 1; claim 2 amended limitation is incorporated from claim 21 now canceled; claim 5 limitation is the same limitation as claim 10; claim 19 amended limitation is described in paragraph 42; claim 22 amended limitation is described in paragraph 45; claims 26 and 31 have the same or similar limitations as claim 2; claims 27 and 32 have the same or similar limitation as claim 5; claims 28, 33, and 35 limitation is shown in Figure 2 and described in paragraph 51; and claims 29 and 34 have the same or similar limitations as claims 10 and 11.

1. Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 112

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 9, 18, 19, 22, 23, and 24 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph (see Office Action, paragraphs 1-9, pages 2-4). In response thereto, Applicant has amended claims 1, 19 and 22 and canceled claims 9, 18, 23, and 24. Rejection of the canceled claims is now believed to be overcome.

With regard to the amended claims: claim 1 was amended to clarify the use of the term "directed at an output device" (see Office Action, paragraph 1, page 2); further, claim 1 was amended to clarify "how the document server communicates with the output device" (see Office Action, paragraph 2, page 2); claim 19 was amended to clarify the use of the term "inadequate" with the term "insecure" (see Office Action, paragraph 4, page 3); and claim 22 was amended to clarify the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application No. 09/682,489

meaning of "specified using a name of the document" with "URL" (see Office Action, paragraph 5, page 3). The rejection of non-canceled claims 1, 19, and 22 is therefore believed to be overcome.

2. Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102 and 103

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 12, 16, 17, 20, 21, and 23 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Parulski et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,666,159 (hereinafter referred to as Parulski) (see Office Action, paragraphs 10-12, pages 4-7). Of these claims, claims 1, 3, 7, 8 are still pending.

In response to the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, in the Office Action, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to more clearly set forth and claim what is believed to be Applicant's invention. As amended, Applicant's invention recited in claim 1 concerns the bridging of two networks with a mobile computing device on which a document service request is initiated. As shown in Applicant's Figure 1 and claimed by Applicant in interdependent claim 1, the mobile computing device bridges an output device responding to a request from the mobile computing device to establish a first wireless communication channel and a document server responding to a request from the mobile computing device to establish a second wireless communication channel.

In contrast, Parulski concerns an electronic camera system that includes programmable transmission capability to transmit electronic image data to remote receiver units. Image data is recorded by an image module and transmitted by a radio-frequency module to remote receiver units. Selection of the remote receiver units may be made by the operator of the camera system and if appropriate the recorded image "can be [] converted to an appropriate format" by the camera system prior to transmitting it (see column 4, lines 1-4). (See Parulski column 1, line 44 to column 2, line 5.)

More specifically Parulski fails to disclose or suggest, as claimed by Applicant in independent claim 1, using a mobile computing device for carrying out a document service request using a first and a second wireless communication channels. Over the first wireless communication channel a type of output device is identified at the mobile communication device through a discovery request. The type

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application No. 09/682,489

of output device together with a document identified is transmitted to a document server over the second wireless communication channel for rendering the identified document into a format suitable for the output device. Upon receiving (from the document server over the second wireless communication channel) the document rendered in the format suitable for the output device, the mobile computing device transmits (to the output device over the first communication channel) the rendered document for output thereon.

It should be noted that independent claims 25 and 30 contain the same or very similar limitations to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and therefore the argument presented above with regard to claim 1 applies equally to independent claims 25 and 30. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, 25, and 30 are patentably distinguishable over Parulski taken. Insofar as claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 26-29, and 31-35 are concerned, these claims depend from one of now presumably allowable independent claims 1, 25, and 35 and are also believed to be in allowable condition.

3. Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103

In addition, the Office Action rejects claims 2, 4-6, 11, 22 and 24 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski in view of Anderson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,493,028 (hereinafter referred to as Anderson) (see Office Action, paragraphs 13-15). Further, the Office Action rejects claim 15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski in view of Lamming et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,862,321 (hereinafter referred to as Lamming). There is no need to specifically address the merits of the claims 2, 5, 6, 11, and 22 which have not been canceled because they depend from claim 1 which is clearly patentable for the reasons set forth above.

4. PTO 1449 Attachment Not Received

The Applicant did not receive a copy of a supplemental PTO-1449 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement mailed January 31, 2002 (with one additional cited reference U.S. Patent Publication 2001/0029531 A1 to Ohta).

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application No. 09/682,489

Applicant assumes that the PTO 1449 was received. Applicants respectfully request receiving in a future correspondence a copy of the PTO-1449 form submitted with the IDS dated January 31, 2002 that includes notations indicating that the Examiner has reviewed the cited reference.

5. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of this application and allowance thereof are earnestly solicited. In the event the Examiner considers a personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is hereby requested to call Attorney for Applicant(s), Thomas Zell.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Zell
Thomas Zell
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,481
Telephone: 650-812-4282
Date: April 19, 2004